

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 10-12, 15-19, 21 and 23 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as unpatentable over Ali-Vehmas (EP '120). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In Ali-Vehmas, when performing a new service a single time, a so-called “extension program” or program code is transmitted from the service provider to the telephone. The “extension program” or the program code in the telephone creates new (complete) menus, whereby the menus are adequate for using the new service (see column 3, lines 6-10 and 46-49). A test using the method known from Ali-Vehmas to see whether the stored dialog information is adequate for performing the dialog in question does not take place. In addition, with the method known from Ali-Vehmas (depending on test results), no “request message” is sent to receive additional “dialog information.” Moreover, according to the Ali-Vehmas method a single “extension program” is transmitted by the telecommunications network to the terminal, for example on a separate “intelligent card” or as a “data message” (see column 3, lines 51-54). In the claimed invention, on the other hand, a dialog is divided into parts, and the dialog is executed such that one dialog part is transmitted to the terminal and the other parts are requested.

Claims 5, 13, 14, 20 and 22 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Ali-Vehmas in view of Smith. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the same reasons set forth in the arguments above, and for the following reason. Smith fails to disclose a dialog is divided into parts, and the dialog is executed such that one dialog part is transmitted to the terminal and the other parts are requested (as required by the claimed invention).

New claims 24-26 are supported in the specification at page 19, lines 5-13.

Since the recited structure and method are not disclosed in the applied prior art (either alone or in combination), the claims are patentable.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to

withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no.449122001300. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: June 17, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Kevin R. Spivak

Registration No.: 43,148

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7762